DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 921 EA 022 199

AUTHOR Buck, Beryl; Broussard, Rolland L.
TITLE A Survey of Selected Attitudes of Principals and Assistant Principals before the 1988 Employee Strike, during the 1988 Employee Strike, toward the Collective Bargaining Process, and after the 1989 Employee/Board Contract.
PUB DATE 15 Aug 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (Los Angeles, CA, August 1990). Computer type in appendices may affect legibility.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Assistant Principals; Collective Bargaining; Contracts; Elementary Secondary Education; Labor Relations; Negotiation Agreements; Personnel Management; *Principals; *Strikes; Unions
IDENTIFIERS *Vermilion Parish Schools LA

ABSTRACT

Attitudes of principals and assistant principals before, during, and after a teacher strike that occurred in mid-1988 in Louisiana's "A" parish school system are examined in this study. A second focus is on differences between principals and assistant principals in levels of experience and attitudes. Questionnaires mailed to 23 principals and 11 assistant principals in the Vermilion Parish School System yielded a 76.5 percent response rate. Findings indicate that both groups perceived labor management relations as confrontational and felt excluded from prevention management. They viewed their primary responsibility during the strike as the maintenance of school operations and reported that management training was inadequate for handling these situations. They viewed collective bargaining as beneficial in improving teacher participation, but offering no relief to the pressures of administrative decisionmaking. Levels of experience and education had no significant effect on attitudes between the two groups. Appendices include a copy of the questionnaire and demographic and attitudinal statistics. (12 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326921

A SURVEY OF SELECTED ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS BEFORE THE 1988 EMPLOYEE STRIKE, DURING THE 1988 EMPLOYEE STRIKE, TOWARD THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS, AND AFTER THE 1989 EMPLOYEE/BOARD CONTRACT.

by

Beryl Buck, Ed.S.
Vermilion Parish School System

and

Rolland L. Broussard, Ed.D.
University of Southwestern Louisiana

Paper presented to the
Special Interest Group
on Politics of Education
at the National Conference of
Professors of Educational Administration

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Broussard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Los Angeles, California
August 15, 1990

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 022 199

A SURVEY OF SELECTED ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS BEFORE THE 1988 EMPLOYEE STRIKE, DURING THE 1988 EMPLOYEE STRIKE, TOWARD THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS, AND AFTER THE 1989 EMPLOYEE/BOARD CONTRACT.

by

Beryl Buck, Ed.S.
Vermilion Parish School System

and

Rolland L. Broussard, Ed.D.
University of Southwestern Louisiana

Abstract

In mid-1988, teachers in the "A" Parish School System walked off their jobs. Eighty-eight percent of employees and over 80 percent of students were not in attendance at the schools. During, and subsequent to the Employee/Board action, selected board members were "recalled" and later "voted out" of office.

This study examined the attitudes of principals and assistant principals prior to, during, and subsequent to the strike. A questionnaire was distributed to 23 principals and 11 assistant principals. The response rate was at 76.5 percent.

Numerous principals and assistant principals generalized that feelings were tense between the board and school personnel. They also believed that the school board had been actively involved in managing the school district prior to the strike. Some administrators felt not well prepared from prior university course work or district training to function in the dynamics of the work action.

INTRODUCTION

On Friday, August 26, 1988, teachers in the Vermilion Parish School System walked out. On the following Monday, August 29, many bus drivers and some educational support personnel joined the ranks of striking school teachers. For several days, striking school employees and board members were involved in a labor-management struggle that was not resolved until an Employee/Board strike settlement was signed on September 6, 1988.

No one who has not experienced a strike can appreciate how frustrating and stressful one can be not only for employees but also for management. In the case of the Vermilion Parish strike, principals and assistant principals operated the schools for the duration of the strike despite reports that 88 percent of the school employees and over 80 percent of the students were not in attendance at the schools.

Subsequent to the strike, the Strike Settlement Agreement provided school employees with the right to begin to collectively bargain a master contract with the Vermilion Parish School Board no later than sixty days after the strike was settled. By October of 1989, both the Vermilion Association of Educators, a local affiliate of the National Education Association, and the Vermilion Parish School Board had ratified an Employee/Board contract.

Once again a labor organization had represented an attempt by human beings to deal with a large social institution. But what of those human beings who represented the large social institution? Principals and assistant principals must find themselves in an awkward situation during a strike, during the bargaining of a contract, and after a contract is ratified. More and more school administrators will be forced to deal not only with individuals and organized groups but also with labor unions. Have principals and assistant principals been trained to manage effectively during a strike and its aftermath of negotiations and contracts? Are school administrators provided with central management support during a strike situation? Does central management solicit and value input from principals and assistant principals when the schools are threatened by the possibility of an employee strike or in the event of a strike? How much stress do school administrators experience during a labor-management struggle? What are the expectations of school leaders before and after the ratification of a labor-management agreement? Are conflicts created in the principals' or assistant principals' perceptions of their roles in decision-making?

PURPOSE

The specific purpose of this study is to provide new knowledge to the field of school administration by:

1. Surveying selected attitudes of principals and assistant principals before the 1988 Employee Strike, during the 1988 Employee Strike, toward the collective bargaining process, and after the 1989 Employee/Board Contract.

2. Detecting differences in levels of agreement between principals and assistant principals, and between principals and assistant principals possessing varied ranges of teaching, administrative, building level, and organized labor experience.

RELATED LITERATURE

According to Chester E. Finn, Jr., in his article "Teacher Unions and School Quality: Potential Allies or Inevitable Foes?" teacher unions are not only here to stay but continue to grow with nearly 90 percent of American public school teachers belonging to the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers or some other type of union. In addition, teachers in thirty-eight states bargain collectively. Finn further implies that this revolution in labor-management relations might function well since everyone involved with the school will be engaged in decision-making. He maintains

that there is evidence that the collective bargaining process may mature "to the point that mutuality and cooperation can occasionally be achieved" (1).

In recent years much attention has been focused on teacher unionism in the public schools of the United States. Baugh and Stone (2) researched unionization's impact on wages. Olson (3) and Goldberg (4) investigated all the different facets of school teacher strikes. Ebert (5) researched collective bargaining and its positive and negative impacts on teaching, and Paschall and Vornberg (6) examined the degree of satisfaction that collective bargaining had provided for teachers.

It appears that, for years, researchers and behavioral scientists have been attempting to find relationships between employees' job-related attitudes and their work behavior; however, in the case of public education, it seems that the needs and perceptions of principals and assistant principals may have been subordinated to those of students and teachers. "The price of such an oversight may be high" (7). While many studies report an increase in teacher stress or teacher burnout, few studies report on the burnout syndrome of school based administrators. Sarros discovered that the work conditions most likely to contribute to burnout were "work stress, work overload, a deteriorating sense of status and recognition, and unsatisfactory interpersonal relationships"(8).

Articles written by Redfern (9), Futz and Caldwell (10), Anderson (11), and Addleston (12) leave little doubt that many principals feel collective bargaining has limited their power in decision-making. This feeling combined with a feeling that community support is low could create a morale problem among principals. All of this could lead to separate bargaining units for principals as it has in California and/or the inability of the public schools system to effectively achieve its goals. The effects of teacher unionism and activities as well as the effects of teacher union-management power struggles on principals and assistant principals offer much room for further study.

PROCEDURE

A questionnaire and a cover letter were mailed to the 34 school administrators, 23 principals and 11 assistant principals, in the Vermilion Parish School System (See Appendix A). From these, 26 surveys, those of 16 principals and 10 assistant principals were returned giving a 76.5 percent response rate. Data regarding administrative level, building level, years of teaching and administrative experience, educational background, and prior union affiliation or experiences were obtained as demographic variables (See Appendix B). The researcher developed the survey which assessed selection attitudes

before the 1988 Employee Strike, during the 1988 Employee Strike, toward the collective bargaining process, and after the Employee/Board Contract.

The instrument was an attitudinal survey with thirty-four items. Directions on the survey instructed respondents to indicate their opinions on a five choice scale as: strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), neither agree nor disagree (N), agree (A), strongly agree (SA).

Responses were then tabulated (See Appendix C). The data were appropriately grouped. For example: "strongly agree" responses were combined with "agree" responses to gain a tendency toward attitudes.

FINDINGS

Of the 26 school administrators who participated in the survey, only 6 principals and 3 assistant principals indicated that they had ever belonged to a union, had a family member who belonged to a union, or had been affected by union activity during previous employment. There was no significant difference in these administrators' attitudes as compared to those who indicated they had not been involved with unions; therefore, demographic questions 6, 7, and 8 are not variables in this study.

Concerning demographic questions 9 and 10, nine (9) principals' responses and seven (7) assistant principal

responses indicated that they believed the tone of management-labor relations in the school system before the 1988 employee strike was either that of an armed truce or hostile. Concerning questions 10, nine (9) principals and three (3) assistant principals believed management-labor relations after the Employee-Board Contract represented an armed truce, two (2) principals and (2) assistant principals believed the tone to be hostile, while only one (1) principal and (1) assistant principal believed the tone to be peaceful.

Demographic items 9 and 10 indicate that no school administrators believed that management-labor trusted one another before the strike nor after Employee/Board Contract. Responses indicated that school administrators believed that management labor relations before the strike represented hostility and/or an armed truce and since the contract, represents more of an armed truce. There was no significance between responses and the length of time a school administrator had served the system and/or his credentials.

In Section B, respondents were asked to provide their attitudes toward statements directed to employees, the school board, and management and training practices before the 1988 Employee Strike. In item 1, 20 (76%) agreed that school employees exhibited low job satisfaction prior to the strike, and in item 2, 21 (81%) agreed that school

district management practices had promoted employee confrontation.

Concerning item 3, 21 (81%) respondents believed that central management had not requested input from them in an attempt to prevent the strike. A wide range of opinion existed for item 4. Thirteen (50%) disagreed while 10 (39%) agreed that a district wide planning effort had been launched before the strike to prepare them to manage their schools in the event of a strike. Interestingly, 8 (50%) of the principals and 5 (50%) of the assistant principals disagreed consistently on these two items. Concerning item 5, 18 (60%) of the respondents and 13 (81%) of the 16 principals agreed that some administrators were sympathetic to the employee situation and actively encouraged the onset of the strike. Seventeen (65%) of the respondents agreed to item 6. They believed that the school board had been actively involved in managing the school district prior to the strike.

In Section C, respondents were asked to provide their attitudes toward their managerial training, their responsibilities, their participation, their community status, along with the associated stress they experienced during the 1988 Employee Strike. Concerning item 7, 23 (88%) believed that keeping the schools in operation regardless of their personal opinions was their primary

responsibility. Items 8, 14, and 15 addressed the stress levels that the principals and assistant principals had experienced during the strike. Community opinion in favor of closing the school did not affect 16 (62%) of the respondents, nor had 19 (73%) questioned their career choice because of strike-related stress. Item 14 sought to determine which attitude (a or b) had contributed more stress to school administrators; however, the forced choice survey item must have been unclear to respondents because both items (a or b) were answered. Twelve (46%) respondents believed it was their responsibility to encourage all employees to report to work during the strike while 24 (92%) believed that their community standing had not been diminished by their attempts to continue to operate schools.

Items 11 and 12 sought to determine school administrators' perceptions about their training. Fourteen (54%) believed that they had not been adequately prepared by coursework or school district managerial training. Interestingly, 8 responded to (N) on item 12. Sixteen (62%), 10 of which were principals, believed that they had not been given an opportunity to make suggestions to central management concerning strike management and strike closure.

In Section D principals and assistant principals were asked to provide their attitudes toward collective

bargaining, their training in negotiations, and their role in the collective bargaining process. Concerning items 16 and 17, 22 (82%) of the respondents believed that their managerial coursework had not adequately prepared them to understand nor participate in the collective bargaining process, and 18 (69%) of the respondents believed that the school district had not adequately trained them.

Concerning negotiations, twenty-two (85%) respondents in item 18 believed that the collective bargaining process was one of confrontation between the school board and employees. Nineteen (73%) of the respondents on item 19 believed that they had not been informed by central management throughout the bargaining process. On item 20, 17 (65%) respondents agreed that an adequate period of time had been provided for the negotiation of a contract, and 21 (81%) agreed that the principals and/or assistant principals should be at the negotiations table to bargain an Employee/Board Contract for management. There was no majority consensus on item 22, that the decision making process has been improved by collective bargaining; however, 18 (69%) agreed, in item 23, that management employees should use the collective bargaining process to ensure their participation in educational decision-making. Twelve (12) of 16 principals agreed.

In Section E principals and assistant principals were asked to provide their attitudes toward the Employee/Board

Contract, its implementation, and its effect on the school district since its ratification. Concerning item 24, 14 (54%) respondents agreed that an adequate period of time had elapsed between the completion of the Employee/Board Contract and its ratification. On items 25 and 26, nineteen (73%) respondents did not believe their managerial coursework had prepared them to implement the Employee/Board Contract, and 14 (53%) did not believe that their school district managerial training had prepared them.

Attitudes about the contract revealed that fifteen (58%) respondents on item 27 did not believe that contract implementation had demanded too much time away from their regular school duties. Fifteen (58%) respondents on item 29 agreed that the Employee/Board Contract has engaged employees and administrators in shared decision-making, but a majority consensus was not reached on item 30 concerning whether or not the Employee/Board Contract has created a schism between principals and employees. Eighteen (69%) respondents on item 31 did non believe that the uniform guidelines provided by the Employee/board Contract had contributed to a decrease in their stress levels, and eighteen (69%) on item 32 did not believe that the contract has relieved them of making decisions they would have preferred not making prior to the contract.

Whereas 65 percent of the respondents in Section B, item 6 believed that the school board had been involved in managing the school district prior to the strike, only 16 (62%) agreed in item 28 that the School Board now allows the superintendent to manage all aspects of school district operations. Twenty-one (81%) of the respondents agreed on item 33, that it was the responsibility of building principals to enforce the Employee/Board Contract while there was no majority consensus on item 34 as to whether or not school employees exhibit higher job satisfaction since the Employee/Board Contract.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been demonstrated in previous studies that school administrators' attitudes are important to the effectiveness of a school system. This research investigated the degree to which principals and assistant principals agreed or disagreed with selected attitudinal statements before the 1988 Employee Strike, during the 1988 Employee Strike, toward the collective bargaining process, and after the 1988 Employee/Board Contract in order to provide new knowledge to the field of school administration.

The most important findings of this study form the basis for the following conclusions.

1. Principals and assistant principals perceive that

labor-management relations at this time represent that of an armed truce and that management practices before the employee strike promoted employee confrontation.

2. Principals and assistant principals perceive that their input had not been solicited concerning the prevention, management, and/or closure of the strike.

3. Some principals and some assistant principals may have been part of a district-wide planning and training effort before the strike, but some were not.

4. Principals and assistant principals perceive other principals and assistant principals to have been sympathetic to the employee situation and active in encouraging the onset of the strike.

5. Principals and assistant principals perceive the school board as having been involved in managing the school district before the strike and since the contract.

6. Principals and assistant principals did not experience a high degree of stress on the selected attitudes provided in the survey.

7. Principals and assistant principals perceive their primary responsibility during a strike to be to keep schools in operation.

8. Principals and assistant principals perceive their managerial coursework and school district managerial training to have been inadequate to prepare them to manage

during an employee strike and its aftermath of collective negotiations and contract implementation.

9. Principals and assistant principals perceive labor-management negotiations to have been one of confrontation.

10. Principals and assistant principals desire to negotiate an Employee/Board Contract for management.

11. Principals and assistant principals perceive it to be their responsibility to implement an Employee/Board Contract.

12. Principals and assistant principals perceive the collective bargaining process to be beneficial to management employees as a way to ensure their participation in educational decision-making although they perceive that the Employee/Board Contract has not contributed to a decrease in their levels of stress nor has it relieved them of making decisions that they would have preferred not making.

13. It may be too soon to assess whether or not a schism has been created between employees and school administrators or if employees exhibit higher job satisfaction since the Employee/Board Contract has been implemented.

14. Degree earned, number of years of teaching or administrative experience, building level of school, union affiliation or experience cannot be counted as factors.

While investigating principals' and assistant principals' attitudes does provide valuable insights, this study should serve as a starting point for further research into the situational dynamics that affect school administrators' attitudes especially with regard to labor-management relations.

REFERENCES

1. C.E. Finn, "Teacher Unions and School Quality: Potential Allies or Inevitable Foes?" Phi Delta Kappan January 1985: 331-337.

2. W.H. Baugh and J.A. Stone, "Teachers, Unions, and Wages in the 1970's: Unionism Now Pays," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 1982: 368-376.

3. C.A. Olson, "The Role of Rescheduled School Days in Teacher Strikes," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 1984: 515-528.

4. A.I. Goldberg, "The Local Community and Teacher Strike Solidarity," Industrial Relations 1974: 288-298.

5. R.W. Eberts, "Union Effects on Teacher Productivity," Industrial and Labor Relations Review 1984: 346-358.

6. M.S. Paschall and J.A. Vornberg, "Secondary Public School Teachers' Satisfaction with Collective Bargaining," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector 1984: 85-94.

7. D.L. Duke, "Why Principals Consider Quitting," Phi Delta Kappan December 1988: 308-312.

8. J.C. Sarros, "Administrator Burnout: Findings and Future Directions," The Journal of Educational Administration July 1988: 184-192.

9. G.B. Redfern, "Negotiations Change Principal-Teacher Relationships," Professional Negotiations and the Principalship. Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

10. F.W. Lutz and W.E. Caldwell, "Collective Bargaining and the Principal" in The Principal in Metropolitan Schools, D.A. Erickson and T.L. Reller (eds.). CA: McCutchan Publishing, 1979.

11. L.W. Anderson, "The Management Team and Negotiations," NASSP Bulletin October 1969: 106-115.

12. L.W. Addleston, "The Principal's Stake in Professional Negotations," NASSP Bulletin May 1969: 181-190.

APPENDIX A

To: Principals and Assistant Principals

From: Beryl S. Buck

Subject: A Field Study of the Selected Attitudes of Principals and Assistant Principals Before the 1988 Employee Strike, During the 1988 Employee Strike, Toward the Collective Bargaining Process, and After the 1989 Employee/Board Contract.

As a course requirement for a specialist degree from U.S.L., I have chosen to research the topic noted above. In order to write my research paper, I am surveying all of the principals and assistant principals in Vermilion Parish public schools; therefore, I would appreciate your completion of the attached survey as soon as possible. Complete participation in the survey will produce more accurate conclusions. This survey is being conducted solely to contribute new information to the field of school administration so you can expect confidentiality in this study.

Please return the survey to me in the addressed envelope attached to the survey by Friday, November 17 since I would like to use the Thanksgiving Holidays to compile the survey results and to begin writing the research paper.

I sincerely appreciate your taking the time from your busy schedule to complete the survey. I will be happy to share my findings with each of you.

Beryl S. Buck

Beryl S. Buck, teacher
Erath High School

A Survey of Selected Attitudes of Principals and Assistant Principals Before the 1988 Employee Strike, During the 1988 Employee Strike, Toward the Collective Bargaining Process, and After the 1989 Employee/Board Contract.

SECTION A: In this section provide demographic information by placing a check mark in the blank next to the appropriate choice.

1. Are you a _____ principal or an _____ assistant principal?

2. How long have you been a principal or an assistant principal of a school?
___ 1-5 years
___ 6-10 years
___ 11-15 years
___ More than 16 years

3. How long had you taught school before becoming an administrator?
___ 1-5 years
___ 6-10 years
___ 11-15 years
___ More than 16 years

4. How much formal education do you have?
___ BA
___ BA + Master's Degree
___ BA + Master's Degree + Certification (30+)
___ BA + Master's Degree + Specialist Degree
___ Other _____

5. At what level is your building?
___ Elementary
___ Middle
___ Secondary

6. Have you ever belonged to a union?
___ yes
___ no

7. Has a member of your family ever belonged to a union?
___ yes
___ no

8. Has your previous employment experience ever been affected by union activity?
___ yes
___ no

9. What is your impression of the tone of management-labor relations in the Vermilion Parish School System before the 1988 employee strike?
___ hostile
___ armed truce
___ trusting
___ peaceful
___ cooperative

10. What is your impression of the tone of management-labor relations in the Vermilion Parish School System after the board/employee contract ratification?
___ hostile
___ armed truce
___ trusting
___ peaceful
___ cooperative

Below are 34 statements which reflect attitudes prior to the 1988 employee strike, at the time of the 1988 employee strike, at the time that an employee/board contract was negotiated and after the employee/board contract was ratified. Please circle your opinion on the scale that follows each statement.

(SD)	(D)	(N)	(A)	(SA)
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

SECTION B: Attitudes Before the Strike In this section provide your attitudes toward the statements directed to employees, the school board, and management training and practices before the 1988 Employee Strike.

1. The school employees exhibited low job satisfaction prior to the strike.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

2. School district management practices promoted employee confrontation.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

3. Central Management requested input from me in an attempt to prevent the strike.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

4. A district-wide planning and training effort was launched before the strike to prepare me to manage my school in the event of a strike.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

5. Some administrators were sympathetic to the employee situation and actively encouraged the onset of the strike.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

6. The School Board was actively involved in managing the school district.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

SECTION C: Attitudes During the Strike In this section provide your attitudes toward your managerial training, your responsibilities, your participation, and your community status along with the associated stress you experienced during the 1988 Employee Strike.

7. My primary responsibility as a principal/assistant principal was to keep the school in operation regardless of my personal opinions.

   SD D N A SA

   Comments:

8. My stress level was high during the strike when it appeared that the community opinion supported the closing of the schools.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

9. To encourage all employees to report to work during the strike was my responsibility as principal/assistant principal of the school.

SD D N A SA

10. My standing in the community was diminished by my attempts to continue to operate the school.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

11. My managerial course work adequately prepared me to manage effectively during the strike.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

12. My school district managerial training adequately prepared me to manage effectively during the strike.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

13. Principals and assistant principals were given an opportunity to make suggestions to central management concerning strike management and strike closure.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

14a. My stress level was higher during the strike because I received little direction or information from central management.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

OR

b. My stress level was higher during the strike because as the visible administrator at the school, I absorbed the negativity toward the School Board.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

15. I questioned my career choice because of the stress associated with the strike.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

SECTION D: Attitudes Toward the Collective Bargaining Process In this section provide your attitudes toward collective bargaining, your training in negotiating, and your role in the collective bargaining process.

16. My managerial course work adequately prepared me to understand collective bargaining and to participate in the collective bargaining process.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

17. My school district managerial training adequately prepared me to understand collective bargaining and to participate in the collective bargaining process.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

18. The collective bargaining process was one more of confrontation between the school board and employees more than building principals and employees.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

19. Central Management kept me informed throughout the bargaining process.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

20. An adequate period of time was provided for the bargaining of the contract.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

21. Principals and/or Assistant Principals should be at the table to negotiate an Employee/Board contract for management.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

22. The decision making process has been improved by collective bargaining.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

23. Management employees should use the collective bargaining process to ensure their participation in educational decision-making.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

SECTION E: Attitudes After Contract Ratification: In this section provide your attitudes toward the contract, its implementation, and its effect on the school district since its ratification.

24. The time period between the completion of the Employee/Board Contract and its ratification was adequate.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

25. My managerial coursework prepared me to implement the Employee/Board Contract.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

26. My school district managerial training prepared me to implement the Employee/ Board Contract.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

27. Contract implementation has demanded too much time away from my regular school duties.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

28. The School Board now allows the Superintendent to manage all aspects of school district operations.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

29. The Employee/Board Contract has engaged employees and administrators in shared decision-making.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

30. The attitudes generated by the Employee/Board contract have created a schism (break) between principals and employees.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

31. The uniform guidelines provided by the Employee/Board Contract has contributed to a decrease in the stress associated with my position.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

32. The Employee/Board Contract has relieved me of making decisions that I would have preferred not making prior to its ratification.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

33. It is the responsibility of building principals to enforce Employee/Board Contracts.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

34. The school employees exhibit higher job satisfaction since the Employee/Board Contract has been ratified.

SD D N A SA

Comments:

Please comment or reference any pertinent issues that may not have been addressed in this survey.

APPENDIX B

A Survey of Selected Attitudes of Principals and Assistant Principals Before the 1988 Employee Strike, During the 1988 Employee Strike, Toward the Collective Bargaining Process, and After the 1989 Employee/Board Contract

Demographic Information

1. Are you a 16 principal or a 10 assistant principal?

2. How long have you been a principal or assistant principal of a school?
   13 1 - 5 years
   6 6 - 10 years
   6 11 - 15 years
   1 more than 16 years

3. How long had you taught school before becoming an administrator?
   1 - 5 years
   9 6 - 10 years
   11 11 - 15 years
   6 more than 16 years

4. How much formal education do you have?
   BA
   1 BA + Master's Degree
   19 BA + Master's Degree + Certification (30+)
   6 BA + Master's Degree + Specialist Degree

5. At what level is your building?
   7 Elementary
   6 Middle
   10 Secondary
   3 Elementary and Middle Combined
   1 Self-Contained K-12
   1 Middle and Secondary

6. Have you ever belonged to a union?
   6 yes
   20 no

7. Has a member of your family ever belonged to a union?
   5 yes
   21 no

8. Has your previous employment experience ever been affected by union activity?
   1 yes
   25 no

9. What is your impression of the tone of management-labor relations in the Vermilion Parish School System before the 1989 employee strike?
   9 hostile
   7 armed truce
   trusting
   3 peaceful
   4 cooperative
   3 write in

10. What is your impression of the tone of management-labor relations in the Vermilion Parish School System after the Board/Employee Contract?
    3 hostile
    13 armed truce
    trusting
    3 peaceful
    6 cooperative
    1 write in

APPENDIX C

A Survey of Selected Attitudes of Principals and Assistant Principals Before the 1988 Employee Strike, During the 1988 Employee Strike, Toward the Collective Bargaining Process, and After the 1989 Employee/Board Contract

Crossbreak Tabulation of Attitudes

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No Opinion
Section B.						
1.	1	3	2	15	5	
2.		3	2	14	7	
3.	11	10	2	2		1
4.	7	6	3	8	2	
5.	1	1	6	14	4	
6.	1	7	1	11	6	
Section C.						
7.			2	17	6	1
8.	4	12	3	4	2	1
9.	5	4	4	10	2	1
10.	12	12	2			
11.	6	8	8	2	2	
12.	5	9	6	5	1	
13.	2	14	2	8		
14a.		2	6	7	1	
14b.	1	2	5	7	1	
15.	8	11	2	3	2	
Section D.						
16.	6	16	1	2	1	
17.	6	12	5	3		
18.		2	2	12	10	
19.	4	10	3	9		
20.	3	6		17		
21.		1	3	14	8	
22.	1	9	5	10	1	
23.		2	5	15	3	
Section E.						
24.	2	7	3	14		
25.	5	14	2	4	1	
26.	3	11	3	9		
27.	1	14	4	5	1	1
28.	1	5	4	10	6	
29.	2	4	5	15		
30.	4	8	3	8	2	1
31.	2	16	5	3		
32.	3	15	6	2		
33.	2	2	1	16	5	
34.		12	3	9	2	